

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
(609) 989-2040

CHAMBERS OF
TONIANNE J. BONGIOVANNI
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

U.S. COURTHOUSE

402 E. STATE STREET, RM 6052
TRENTON, NJ 08608

May 14, 2008

LETTER ORDER

Re: Lentz v. Gusmer Corporation, et al.
Civil Action No. 05-3047 (AET)

Dear Counsel:

The Court has received and reviewed your correspondence regarding Ms. Elovich's request for a two week extension of time within which to file opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment and for permission to file an overlength brief since Defendants were permitted to do so. The Court appreciates Defendants' consent to this application and notes that defense counsel has requested that only an additional week be permitted, but has agreed to "accept whatever schedule the court directs in this matter without objection." (Ltr. from Clark to Judge Bongiovanni of May 14, 2008.) After reviewing counsel's request, the Court reluctantly grants same.

The Court notes that it endeavors to accommodate counsel's schedules where practical. The Court also, however, notes that it has a duty to "secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action." FED.R.CIV.P. 1. The instant matter has been on the Court's Civil Docket since June 2005. In other words, it is nearly three years old. The Court has expended significant judicial resources on this matter, many of which have been unfortunately spent handling typically mundane issues, which normally are resolved by the parties, such as whether an extension should be granted. The Court can only imagine the

resources expended by the parties to date.

Consequently, while the Court grants the latest request for an extension, as previously stated it does so reluctantly. Moreover, the Court wants to be clear: absent truly extenuating circumstances, no additional extensions shall be granted. Not including the instant extension request, three previous requests for extensions regarding the timing of this Motion have not only been entertained by this Court, but have also been granted. Enough is enough. The Court is intent on adhering to the policy espoused in Rule 1, and will see to it that this matter is handled in as “just, speedy, and inexpensive” manner as possible.

Further, while the Court appreciates that Ms. Elovich is a solo practitioner, that fact is of little moment. As a solo practitioner, it is Ms. Elovich’s responsibility to manage her own caseload and to take on only as many cases as she can practically handle. As a matter of course, the Court expects all practitioner’s, solo or not, to be able to abide by the deadlines it sets. Given the frequency with which extensions have been requested, the Court is concerned that Ms. Elovich may have overextended herself.

Nevertheless, the Court grants Ms. Elovich’s request to have until **June 2, 2008** to file Plaintiff’s opposition to Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment. Similarly, the Court grants her request to file an overlength brief and permits Ms. Elovich to file an opposition brief that is no longer than 55 pages in Times New Roman 12 point font. Defendants’ reply shall be filed no later than **June 9, 2008** and this Motion shall be returnable on **June 16, 2008**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Tonianne J. Bongiovanni
TONIANNE J. BONGIOVANNI
United States Magistrate Judge